[all counsel listed on signature page] 1 2 DENIED WITHC 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION 11 AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES GENERAL IP Case No. 5:04-cv-05385-JW 12 PTE LTD. and AVAGO TECHNOLOGIES ORDER DENYING STIPULATION FOR ECBU IP PTE LTD., organized and 13 ORDER CONTINUING PRETRIAL incorporated under the laws of Singapore, **CONFERENCE** 14 Plaintiffs and Counterclaim-Defendants, 15 Date: March 23, 2009 VS. Time: 3:00 p.m. 16 Judge: James Ware ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORP., a Courtroom: Taiwanese corporation, and ELAN 17 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP, a 18 California Corporation, 19 Defendants and Counterclaim-Plaintiff. 20 21 Plaintiffs Avago Technologies General IP PTE LTD and Avago Technologies ECBU IP 22 PTE LTD ("Avago") and Defendant Elan Microelectronics Corporation ("Elan"), through their 23 undersigned counsel, stipulate as follows and jointly respectfully request an Order rescheduling the Joint 24 Pretrial Conference Statement, the Pretrial Conference, and trial. 25 1. The parties have re-opened settlement negotiations and are planning a meeting in 26 California in early March. 27 2. The parties wish to minimize litigation expenses pending the March meeting and to avoid 28 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] 1 5:04-cy-05385-JW ORDER RESCHEDULING PRETRIAL

CONFERENCE AND TRIAL

1		burdening the Court in th	ne event that the parties are successful in	reaching settlement
2		terms.		
3	3.	Under the current schedu	ile, the Joint Pretrial Conference Stateme	ent and accompanying
4		Motion in Limine, exhibit	ts lists, witness lists and related exhibits	are due February 23,
5		2009. The Pretrial Confe	erence is scheduled for March 23, 2009 a	at 3:00 p.m. Jury
6		Selection is currently set	for April 14 and trial is set to commence	e April 15, 2009.
7	4.	The parties jointly reques	st that the Court reschedule the Pretrial C	Conference and trial and
8		vacate the February 23, 2	2009 Joint Pretrial Conference Statement	deadline so that the
9		parties can devote their e	fforts to settlement efforts rather than tri	al preparation.
10	Dated: Februa	ary 17, 2009	Respectfully submitted,	
11		,		
12			Richard E. Lyon (SBN 229288) IRELL & MANELLA LLP	
13 14			1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900 Los Angeles, California 90067-4276 Telephone: (310) 277-1010 r-lyon@irell.com	
15			Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
16			Avago Technologies General IP PTR I Technologies ECBU IP PTE Ltd.	td. and Avago
17			By: /s/ Richard E. Lyon	
18			Richard E. Lyon	
19			Elizabeth H. Rader (SBN 184963) ALSTON & BIRD LLP	
20			Two Palo Alto Square 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 400	
21			Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112 Telephone: (650) 838-2000	
22			elizabeth.rader@alston.com	
23			Attorneys for Defendants and Countered ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORI	
24			ELAN INFORMATION TECHNOLO	
25			By:/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader	
26			Elizabeth H. Rader	
27				
28	STIPULATION	I AND [PROPOSED]	2	5·04-cv-05385-IW

ORDER RESCHEDULING PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND TRIAL

1					
2	<u>FILER'S ATTESTATION</u>				
3	Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X (B) regarding signatures, I, Elizabeth H. Rader,				
4	attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.				
5	/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader_				
6	Elizabeth H. Rader				
7					
8					
9					
10					
11	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE				
12	I certify that all counsel of record, who are deemed to have consented to electronic service, are being served on February 17, 2009, with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system.				
13					
14					
15	Morgan Chu, Esq. mchu@irell.com				
16	Alan J. Heinrich, Esq. aheinrich@irell.com				
17	David C. McPhie, Esq. dmcphie@irell.com				
18	Richard E. Lyon, III, Esq. rlyon@irell.com				
19	Samuel Kai Lu, Esq. slu@irell.com				
20					
21	By: <u>/s/ Elizabeth H. Rader</u> Elizabeth H. Rader				
22					
23	Attorney for Defendants ELAN MICROELECTRONICS CORP. and ELAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP				
24	ELAN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUP				
25					
26					
27					
28					

PROPEREDLORDER

Although the Court is encouraged that the parties have re-opened settlement negotiations, the Court finds that, in light of the age of the case and the parties' previous efforts at settlement, vacating the pretrial deadlines would only create a further delay in resolving this 2004 case. Accordingly, the Court DENIES the parties' Stipulation without prejudice to be renewed. Nothing in this Order prevents the parties from completing the pretrial processes and simultaneously discuss settlement. In the event that the parties' settlement discussions are fruitful and definite, the parties may renew their request.

Dated: February 19, 2009

XYIES WARE

United States District Judge